

March 28, 2000

ADDENDUM #2 TO EXCEPTION REPORT #4

A substantial portion of the documentation in the LSOG 4 Pre-Order and Order Business Rules and the EDI Pre-Order and Order Guides is incomplete, incorrect or unclear.

Addendum to Issue 4.2

The LSOG 4 Pre-Order Business Rules v 4.1.1 specify that the MLT field on the ADA form occurs '0,1' times and has a length of 81 characters. BA determined during Pre-order testing that multiple MTX segments were being returned for the MLT field. It is unclear whether the Business Rules should reflect that the MLT occurs on this response '0, N' times.

Issue 4.9

In the Order EDI Guide v 4.1.1, the 3.11 LSR EDI example for Hunt Group Level specifies a PO1 type of 'SS'. During order testing, BA determined that the appropriate value for the PO107 should be "HNT" as it relates to the Hunt Group level. It is unclear whether the EDI example is correct.

Issue 4.10

KPMG observed that Bell Atlantic Order EDI LSOG 4 Mechanization Specification (Version 4.1.1) is missing the conversion table for ACT field in the LSR form. Both the ACT (page 77 of 155) and AFO (page 78 of 155) fields reference "Table 2", although Table 2 only contains conversion information regarding the AFO field.

Issue 4.11

The table below depicts missing conversion values for following valid entries for the ACT field in the BA LSOG-4 Order Business Rules (Version 4.1.1, Page 157 of 342) and the BA Order EDI LSOG 4 Mechanization Specification (Version 4.1.1):

#	OBF Code	EDI Code
1	N	A
2	C	C
3	D	D
4	R	R
5	V	V
6	W	W
7	P	P
8	L	L
9	Y	Y

10	H	H
11	X	CT
12	M	M
13	T	T

Based on BA Change Control's response that Table 7 – LNA should be referenced for the ACT field conversions, KPMG observed that Table 7 is missing conversion values for 4 valid ACT field entries I, J, S, B.

Issue 4.12

It is unclear, whether the 'PG_of_ field' on the LR form is valid for BA EDI. The field, as depicted in the BA North Order Business Rules v 4.2.1, refers to a manual method and is shaded elsewhere in the Business Rules. In addition, it is noted as "N/A for EDI" in the EDI Guidelines.

Issue 4.13

- A. The EDI specifications for the DL form (pp. 30-31) map the following data elements (DDAST, DDAZC, DDANO, DDASN, DDASD, DDALOC, DDALO, DDASS, DDAPR, DDASF, DDATH) under the N1*DA. The EDI example 3.3, however, locates the elements under the N1*C1 segment. It is unclear, whether the EDI example is correct.
- B. The EDI specifications for the DRS form (p. 14) reference the LOCNUM field as mapped to REF*IX*LOCNUM*LOCNUM. This mapping is missing, from the EDI Example 3.4.
- C. The EDI specifications for the DSCR form (p. 36) reference the HTN field as mapped to PO1/SI. The EDI Example 3.5, however, depicts the HTN as SLN/SI. The correct mapping for HTN is unclear.
- D. The Business Rules v 4.2.1 note that the ACCEPTREJECT field on the ERR form is valid for WEB GUI only and CR#1216 was issued to correct the discrepancy. The EDI Example 3.6, however, has not been updated.
- E. CR#1275 was issued to update the Business Rules v 4.2.1 to add the ERR_CODE field on the ERR form as a valid data element for EDI. Neither the EDI specifications on page 50 nor the EDI Example 3.6, however, has been updated to include the EDI mapping for ERR_CODE.
- F. CR#1216 was issued to update the EDI Guidelines to add the TCTOPRI field as a valid data element for EDI. It appears, however, that the EDI Example 3.7 has not been updated to correct TCTO to TCTOPRI.

- G. The following data elements (TCID (PRI), TCTOSEC, TCNAME2, TCID (SEC)) on the EU form are noted in the Business Rules v 4.2.1 and the EDI specifications on page 48, but are not depicted within the EDI Example 3.7.
- H. The EDI specifications on page 96 depict the mapping of the LOOPQUAL field on the LS form as PO1/PID05. The EDI Example 3.9, however, depicts the mapping as PO1/PID08. The correct EDI mapping and documentation is not clear.
- I. The EDI specifications on page 103 depict the mapping of the LOOPQUAL field on the LSNP form as PO1/PID05. The EDI Example 3.10, however, depicts the mapping to be as PO1/PID08. The correct EDI mapping and documentation is not clear.
- J. CR#1216 was issued toward clarifying the mapping for the EXP field on the LSR form. There remains a question, however, which is logged as HP/KPMG exception 4.4-C. It is unclear whether the EXP data field is mapped to the SAC04 or if the SAC04 is the literal 'EXP'. Previous BA EDI mappings for EXP mapped a literal 'EXP' to the SAC04 and the data field EXP was mapped to the SAC15. It is unclear, whether the EXP data field is mapped to the SAC04.
- K. The EDI specifications on pages 84-85 include the EDI mappings for the following Bill-To data elements for the LSR form (BILLNM, ACNA, SBILLNM, STREET, CITY, STATE, ZIPCODE, FLOOR, ROOM, BILLCON, TELNO (BILLCON)). The EDI Example 3.11, however, does not include any of these data elements.
- L. The EDI specifications on page 86 depict the mapping for TELNO (INIT) field for the LSR form within the PER segment for INIT. The EDI Example 3.11, however, omits this TELNO mapping.
- M. The EDI specifications on page 67 depict the mapping for the LSRNO field on the LSRBCM form with the qualifier REF01='2I'. The EDI Example 3.12, however, maps LSRNO with the qualifier REF01='OW'. The correct EDI mapping and documentation are unclear.
- N. The EDI specifications on page 70 depict the N903 qualifier mapping for the REMARKS field on the LSRBCM form as N903=BCNCM. The EDI Example 3.12, however, has N903=LSRCM. The correct EDI mapping and documentation are unclear.
- O. The following data elements (SOID, SOBTN, TNS, ECCKT, ACTCODE, FEATQTY, FEATURE, FEATDETINDR, FEATDET, FEATDETDATA) were added to the Business Rules for the LSRBCM form, but are not included in the EDI specifications on pages 134-135.
- P. The following data elements (SOBTN, TNS, ECCKT, FEATDETINDR, FEATDET) were added to the Business Rules for the LSRBCM form, but are not included in the EDI Example 3.12.

- Q. The EDI specifications depicts mapping for the LSRNO field on the LSRPCM form (p. 71) with the qualifier REF01='OW'. The EDI Example v.3.13, however, maps LSRNO with the qualifier REF01='2I'. The correct EDI mapping and documentation are unclear.
- R. The EDI specifications depict the N903 qualifier mapping for the REMARKS field on the LSRPCM form (p. 74) as N903=PCNCM. The EDI Example 3.13, however, has N903=LSRCM. The correct EDI mapping and documentation are unclear.
- S. The Business Rules add the following data elements (SOID, SOBTN, TNS, ECCKT, ACTCODE, FEATQTY, FEATURE, FEATDETINDR, FEATDET, FEATDETDATA) to the LSRBCN for, but not to the LSRPCM form on pages 71-74. The EDI Example 3.13 for LSRPCM form, however, includes the EDI mapping for this data.
- T. The EDI specifications on page 116 do not reference that the TNS field on the PS form is mapped to the SI04 and SI05 as the EDI Example 3.15 depicts.
- U. The EDI specifications on page 124 depict the PO1/SI mapping for CLK field on the RFR form, but the CLK mapping is missing from the EDI Example 3.16.
- V. The EDI specifications on page 128 depict PO1/SI mapping for the RPSPEED field on the RFR form, but the EDI Example 3.16 depicts SLN/SI. The correct EDI mapping and documentation are unclear.
- W. The EDI specifications depict PO1/REF mapping for LNUM field on the RFR form on page 125. The EDI Example 3.16, however, has LNUM mapped as PO1/N9. The correct EDI mapping and documentation are unclear.
- X. The EDI specifications on page 133 reference N101=IT for the IWO data element on the RPL form. The EDI Example 3.17, however, shows no relationship between the PO1/SI mapping and the N1 segment. It appears that this reference is confusing and should be removed.
- Y. The EDI specifications on page 134 reference N101=IT for the GBTN data element. The EDI Example 3.17, however, shows no relationship between the PO1/SI mapping and the N1 segment. It appears that this reference is confusing and should be removed.
- Z. The EDI specifications on page 132 reference the following data elements (FLOOR, ROOM, CITY, STATE and ZIPCODE) as part of the PRILOC field address information. The data elements are missing from the EDI Example 3.17, however.

- AA. The EDI specifications on page 137 reference this CITY field as part of the SECLOC address information. The CITY field is missing from the EDI Example 3.17, however.
- BB. The EDI specifications on page 149 do not reference that the TNS field on the RS form is mapped to the SI04 and SI05 as the EDI Example 3.18 depicts.

Assessment

If LSOG 4 documentation is missing, incorrect or unclear in the Pre-Order and Order Business Rules and the EDI Pre-Order and Order Guides a CLEC cannot receive the correct responses (e.g. confirmation or error) from BA and cannot properly format a transaction.